

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 23-3727 SB (MRWx)	Date	September 29, 2023
Title	Zarate v. Jaguar Land Rover		

Present:	Hon. Michael R. Wilner, U.S. Magistrate Judge		
	James Muñoz	n/a	
	Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	
	Attorneys for Plaintiff:	Attorneys for Defendant:	
	n/a	n/a	

**Proceedings:** ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1. Defendant filed a discovery motion that is not in the joint format mandated under the Local Rules. (Docket # 18.) The motion is accompanied by a statement that indicates that Plaintiff did not provide his portion of the joint motion before the moving party filed it, as required by this Court's Local Rule 37-1. (Docket # 18-1 at 3.)

2. A party's failure to file a required document within a deadline set by local rule or to cooperate in the submission of a joint discovery motion "may be deemed consent to the granting [ ] of the motion." Local Rule 7-12. Therefore, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE for the failure to comply with the joint filing process and to submit a substantive response to the discovery motion by October 6, at 12:00 p.m.<sup>1</sup> If the Court does not receive any submission, the motion will be granted as unopposed under local rule without further proceedings. The Court will also award expenses to the moving party as required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5).

\* \* \*

3. The Court sua sponte vacates the noticed motion hearing date of October 25. As noted on my portion of the Court's website, my courtroom is dark that day.<sup>2</sup> The motion will be heard (if needed) on November 1 at 9:30 a.m.

---

<sup>1</sup> That response will specifically explain how the lengthy objections to RFP # 25 (requesting a copy of the vehicle's registration) comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(b)(2)(B-C).

<sup>2</sup> I'm reasonably confident that the defense lawyers didn't review my procedures page at all. The defense did not reach out for an informal conference with the Court (as offered on the website) to discuss Plaintiff's recalcitrance. Further, the motion is accompanied by over 170 pages of materials that are neither excerpted nor highlighted as required by my civil guidance.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 23-3727 SB (MRWx)	Date	September 29, 2023
Title	Zarate v. Jaguar Land Rover		

---

Ordinarily, I strike exhibits or motions that violate these requirements. I still may, although let's wait to see if this dispute remains live in the coming weeks.